

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are in the application. No claims have been amended. Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

All of the independent claims 1, 10, 22, and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Mantha et al. patent 6,163,779.

First and foremost, in the present invention the web page and linked resources are packaged into a single file. Further the web page is placed in the single file without alteration. Mantha does not pack the selected file and attachment file into a single file. Further, Mantha alters the linked URLs in the web page that he saves. This is because in Mantha the links must point to a separate file for the linked page that has been copied as a separate file into local storage. Therefore Mantha has to change the link to point to that locally stored file.

In the present invention the linked resource file is packaged into the same single file with the selected file. In other words, the unaltered web page and all of the linked resources for the web page are packaged into a single file. By so doing, the original web page is not altered and the links in the web page are merely branch points to another portion of the same file. And, in fact, if for some reason the linked resource could not be packaged into the single file, the link may still be used to link to the original resource.

While the Mantha patent does talk about copying a web page and linked pages to local storage, he copies the linked pages as separate files. This is a significant difference from the present invention, and the difference is reflected in all of the independent claims of the present application. All of the independent claims contain a function for packaging the selected file into a single file along with the attachment file.

Claim 1 recites, "in response to a determination that the selected file includes at least one link to at least one resource file, packing the selected file and the at least one resource file into a single attachment file and attaching the attachment file to the email note."

Claim 10 recites, "...in response to a determination that automatic attachment of the at least one resource file has been authorized, packaging the selected file and the at least one resource file into a single attachment file and attaching the attachment file to the email note."

Claim 22 recites, "...a web page packing object operative to pack the web page and at least one resource file into a single web archive file; wherein the email client is operative to detect the attachment of the web page to the email note and to automatically trigger the web page

packing object to pack the web page and at least one resource file into the single web archive file."

Claim 29 recites, "...in response to a determination that the selected file includes one or more links to resource files, packing the selected file and the one or more resource files into a single attachment file and attaching the attachment file to the email note."

The Mantha reference as stated above does not package the web page and the linked files into a single file. Rather, Mantha copies the web page and the linked files in separate files and modifies the links to point to the separate files stored for the linked resources.

Although there are other differences between the present invention and Mantha certainly because of the above differences reflected in all of the independent claims, all of the independent claims should be allowed and all of the dependent claims should also be allowed.

Conclusion

As all claims now in the application appear to be in condition for allowance, Applicants request the application be allowed and pass to issuance as soon as possible.

If the examiner after reviewing this response still questions the differences between the claimed invention and the Mantha reference, applicants' attorney requests a teleconference to discuss the differences between Mantha and the independent claims. Applicants' attorney may be reached at 303-357-1633 after December 8, 2003.

It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

Merchant & Gould, P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
303.357.1633

Date: November 21, 2003.





Homer L. Knearl
Reg. No. 21,197